

Appln No. 09/437,205

Amdt date September 17, 2003

Reply to Office action of June 17, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 and 25-41 remain in the present application, of which claims 1, 7-8, 21-23, 27-28 and 40-41 are independent. Claim 42 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 23 have been amended herein. Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 27, 28, 40 and 41. Applicants also appreciate the indication that claim 42 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, reexamination and allowance of claims 1-6, 9-20, 23, 25-26 and 29-39. Applicants also respectfully request that the allowance of claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 27, 28, 40 and 41 be maintained.

Applicants appreciate the time and courtesy extended by the Examiner to applicants' attorney (Jun-Young E. Jeon; Reg. No. 43,693) during the telephone interview of September 2, 2003. During the telephone interview, claims 1 and 23 were discussed. During the telephone interview, the Examiner and applicants' attorney reached an agreement that incorporation of the limitation of claim 42 into claims 1 and 23 would patentably distinguish them over the references of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6, 12 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,133,901 ("Law"). The Examiner has also rejected claims 2-5 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Law, and further in view of Foley et al. (Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice). Further, the Examiner has

Appln No. 09/437,205

Amdt date September 17, 2003

Reply to Office action of June 17, 2003

rejected claims 9-11, 13-16, 19-20, 23, 26 and 29-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Law.

As noted above, applicants appreciate the indication that claim 42 is allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As claim 42 depended only from claim 1, applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitation of claim 42 therein, and canceled claim 42.

Therefore, claim 1 now recites, in a relevant portion, "[a] method of displaying a graphical element comprising the steps of: filtering the graphical element with a low pass filter to generate a multi-level value per pixel at an intended final display resolution; reducing a resolution of the multi-level values by at least one bit prior to using them as alpha blend values; and using the multi-level values as the alpha blend values for the graphical element in a subsequent compositing stage. In view of this, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that it be allowed.

Since claims 2-6 and 9-20 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 1 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-6 and 9-20 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate a limitation similar to that of previous claim 42. Claim 23 now recites, in a relevant portion, "[a] graphics display system for displaying a graphical element comprising: a display engine for compositing the graphical element with at least one graphics image using the

Appln No. 09/437,205

Amdt date September 17, 2003

Reply to Office action of June 17, 2003

multi-level values as alpha blend values, wherein generation of the multi-level values do not depend on alpha blend values that existed prior to filtering, and wherein a resolution of the multi-level values are reduced by at least one bit prior to using them as the alpha blend values." Since none of the cited references teaches or suggests such graphics display system, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn and that it be allowed.

Since claims 25, 26 and 29-39 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 23, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 23 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 25, 26 and 29-39 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments are remarks, applicants respectfully request that claims 1-6, 9-20, 23, 25, 26 and 29-39 in addition to the already allowed claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 27, 28, 40 and 41. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By Jun E. Jeon

Jun-Young E. Jeon

Reg. No. 43,693

626/795-9900

JEJ/sd

SD PASS26296.1-*09/17/03 8:32 AM